

REMARKS

Claim 19 is amended. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 13 and 15-19, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

In the Final Office Action dated February 24, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner stated that ambiguity arises due to the specification disclosing at least one of a forearm pad and at least one of a transverse frame member – with the handgrip assembly being included in an alternative embodiment.

The transverse frame member 34 is shown in Figs. 2 and 3. The forearm pads 40 are shown in Fig 2 and the forearm pads 40a are shown in Fig. 3. The handgrip assemblies 42 are shown in Fig. 2 and the handgrip assemblies 84 are shown in Fig. 4. Thus, the transverse frame member, the forearm pads and the handgrip assemblies are included in both embodiments. As explained beginning on Page 6 at Line 11 and continuing through Line 9 on Page 7, the transverse frame member can be used without the forearm pads and the handgrip assemblies, or with one or two of the forearm pads, and/or with one or two of the handgrip assemblies.

In an Advisory Action dated May 10, 2005, the Examiner refused to enter the Amendment filed March 17, but suggested that Claim 19 be amended to include a recitation of the transverse frame member and at least one of the forearm pad and the handgrip assembly for clarity. Applicant amended Claim 19 as suggested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.